



UNITED STATE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	
09/003,972	01/07/98	STOUB		E	3531	.97
Γ			\neg	EXAMINER		
LATHROP AND G		LMC1/0504		ROSSI I ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
2345 GRAND BOULEVARD KANSAS CITY MO				2779	Oldi	8
				DATE M		04/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Application No.

Applicant(s)

09/003,972

STOUB

Office Action Summary Examiner

Jeffrey Allen ROSSI

Group Art Unit 2779



X Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>Dec 27, 1998</u>	9				
☐ This action is FINAL.					
in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle	ept for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed , 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.				
	s set to expire3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever failure to respond within the period for response will cause the extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of				
Disposition of Claims	is/ore pending in the application.				
	is/are pending in the application.				
Of the above, claim(s) NONE	is/are withdrawn from consideration.				
Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
	is/are rejected.				
☐ Claim(s)	is/are objected to.				
☐ Claims are subject to restriction or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent	Drawing Review, PTO-948.				
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are	e objected to by the Examiner.				
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is Lapproved Lisapproved.				
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam	niner.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).				
☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED of	copies of the priority documents have been				
received.					
received in Application No. (Series Code/Se	erial Number)·				
received in this national stage application f	rom the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
*Certified copies not received:					
☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domest	tic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).				
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited, PTO-892	·				
☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449,	Paper No(s). 7				
☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413	DTO 048				
☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review	, PIU-340				
☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152					
. OFF OFFICE ACT	TION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES				
SEE UTFICE ACI	IVIT VIT TILE I VERVILLE I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I				

Art Unit: 2779

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. This action is responsive to: the application filed 1998-01-07, and the Information Disclosure Statement, filed 1997-12-27.
- 2. Claims 1-34 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 12, 18, and 29 are independent.
- 3. The group art unit of the examiner handling your case is now 2779. The Office appreciates the use of the most up to date art unit on all correspondence to help us serve you better.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. Applicant is requested to submit the references cited by the examiner in WO 99/35,592, on which a search report which was issued on 1999-07-15, which claims priority to the present application. Timely filing of foreign cited art reduces the chances of new grounds for rejection after allowance/ before issue, and can shorten prosecution time considerably.

Art Unit: 2779

Priority

5. It is noted that domestic priority to application 09/996,917, by the same inventive entity, was not claimed. The only substantive difference between the two applications that the examiner was able to uncover was the inclusion of a computer program listing in the present application.

Applicant is not required to claim priority to the earlier application, which would shorten patent term under GATT to the date of earliest claimed priority.

Specification

The specification is objected to for the following reasons: the submission of a computer program listing of more than ten pages is improper. The computer program listing should be resubmitted as originally filed in microfiche. See MPEP 608.04(c), and 37 CFR 1.77 (a) (6). This should be done as soon as possible to avoid delays in issue.

Claim Objections

7. Claim 12-17 and 29-34 are objected to because of the following informalities: The use of "including... and combinations thereof" in the preamble is improper. "Including" is equivalent to

Page 4

Art Unit: 2779

comprising. This means that each and every element, i.e., text, graphics, and tables, must be present to anticipate the preamble. Therefore, "and combinations thereof" is nonsensical in this context since all three items would be required. Applicant may us "or" instead. It is furthermore noted that the preamble is given less patentable weight than the rest of the claim. Therefore, the claim is read as if it had properly been written in the alternative form. It is furthermore noted that in claim 15 and 16, no explicit reference was made to the graphic images and tables as set forth in the preamble of claim 12. Therefore, it is clear that applicant has de facto broadly claimed text, graphics, tables, or combinations thereof, since no explicit reference was made to the elements in the preamble. The antecedent basis, to "the electronic document" is insufficient to mandate. "text", "graphics", and "tables" be included in the claimed device. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 2, 14, 19 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2779

- 9. With respect to claims 2 and 19, the phrase "the quantity of at least one column comprising each said display page" is not clear because the quantity of at least one column can not comprise each said display page. It is further not clear that applicant is de facto intending to claim the quantity of columns in each displayed page.
- 10. With respect to claims 14 and 31, the phrase "the size of the characters comprising said non-scrollable pages" is not clear because the size of the characters can not comprise each said scroll-able pages.

Double Patenting

The following is a statement of the statutory basis for a double patenting rejection:

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..."

(Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co., 151

U.S. 186 (1894); In re Ockert, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Page 6

Art Unit: 2779

12. Claims 1-34 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-35 of copending Application No. 08/996.917. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims in the later filed application number 09/003,972 are identical to those submitted previously in 08/996,917. The only substantive difference that examiner was able to uncover between the two patent applications was the inclusion of a computer program listing appendix in the present application. Under no circumstances can claims to identical inventions which are identical in scope in the two patent applications be allowed to issue, as set forth in 35 USC section 101. Applicant should abandon one of the applications, or amend claims to claim different inventions in the two applications.

It is highly recommended that in the case of any amendment believing to overcome the double patent rejection in lieu of express abandonment of one of the copending applications, should concurrently be filed with a terminal disclaimer to the present application, in the interest of compact prosecution,

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

13. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

Art Unit: 2779

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 14. Claim 12 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by <u>Anonymous</u>, International Business Machines Technical Disclosure Bulletin, v.28, n. 2, entitled "Method to Permit Rapid Reading of Displayed Text", pp. 513-515 reprinted on 2 pages (page numbers of references not employed in rejection since it is a short text dump), hereinafter IBM85.
- 15. Per independent claim 12, IBM85 discloses: A computer system for automatically converting a scrollable electronic document, including text, graphics, tables and combinations thereof, from a scrollable format to a non-scrollable format document("read a text stream and format it according to an operator's preferences") the system comprising:
- (a) a page-forming mechanism configured to operatively and automatically arrange the scrollable electronic information document into a plurality of non-scrollable pages ("By setting the window width to show several words per line and the window height of the height of the display, it is possible to get the effect of a newspaper column"), each having at least one column wherein each said column has a width ("values are typically those display values affecting window width and height..."corresponding to a number of characters per line within a predetermined range of characters per line;
- (b) a screen having a display window configured to simultaneously display a selected one of said plurality of non-scrollable pages in its entirety ("window of one or more vertically arranged text lines"); and

Page 8

Art Unit: 2779

(C)a page-turning mechanism configured to selectively, sequentially and individually display said plurality of non-scrollable pages in said display window ("display rate is left on the screen the text is left on the screen to properly read it").

Per independent claim 29, a method performed by the apparatus of independent claim 12, a rejection is made on identical grounds to claim 12. Note that independent claim 29, contrarily to independent claim 12, is limited to the means disclosed in the application, and thus is potentially narrower than independent claim 18. Independent claim 1 is thus more subject to file wrapper estoppel regarding its interpretation than independent claim 18. Thus, applicant should bear in mind that remarks regarding broadest reasonable interpretation of "means plus function" language would be less relevant and restrictive to method claims, which are frequently but not always broader than the identical claims in "means plus function" form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

......

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2779

17. Claims 1-4 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Anonymous, International Business

Machines Technical Disclosure Bulletin, v.28, n. 2, entitled "Method to Permit Rapid Reading of Displayed Text", pp. 513-515 reprinted on 2 pages (page numbers of references not employed in rejection since it is a short text dump), hereinafter IBM85

- 18. Per independent claim 1, IBM85 demonstrates a computer system for converting a scrollable source document ("read a text stream and format it according to an operator's preferences") into a page display document, the source document having information in the form of text ("text stream"), graphics, tables, or combinations thereof, which source document is too large to be fully displayable without scrolling on a display window of a screen associated with the system, the system comprising:
- (a) first formatting means for automatically formatting a screen page that is fully displayable in the display window and comprises at least one column ("By setting the window width to show several words per line and the window height of the height of the display, it is possible to get the effect of a newspaper column"), each having a column width corresponding to a number of characters per line within a predetermined range of characters per line ("window width");
- (b) second formatting means for automatically reformatting the source document to conform with said column width to form a display document comprising a plurality of sequential display pages ("formatting it [the display window] according to the operator's preferences"); and

Page 9

Page 10

Art Unit: 2779

displaying means for automatically filling said at least one column of the display window with a selected one of said plurality of display pages, each said display page being separately and fully displayable in the display window ("fixed window eliminates the need for eye movement, and is the primary contributing factor for speed improvement"), and

(d) paging means ("displaying these windows at a rate corresponding to the operator's ability to comprehend them") for selectively ("key that pauses the reading session") paging, without scrolling, through said plurality of display pages.

The examiner contends that the means plus function broadly describes the notoriously well-known input components, CPU, and monitor/display devices in a computing environment. Should applicant's arguments force a more narrow interpretation of the means plus function language of the present application, however, the present rejection preemptively and in the in the interest of compact prosecution notes the following potential difference between applicant's means and the means of IBM85. Applicant discloses the act of clicking on GUI 50 to initiate a single page turning. IBM85 employs a GUI to initiate a sequence of timed page turnings; including a 'skip to' feature which may be paused (key that pauses the reading session. Examiner does not believe that this difference is embodied in the claim language as presented. However, should applicant argue that this difference limits de facto the scope of the claimed invention, the following "Official Notice" is taken. GUIs and User Interfaces that selectively page forward a single turning were notoriously well-known in the art at the time of the invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a user

Page 11

Art Unit: 2779

interface to initiate a single page turning in IBM85 in order to allow the user flexibility to determine a desired rate for each page turning in "Rapid Reading of Displayed Text", and thus enhance the "user preferences" of IBM85.

- 19. Per independent claim 18, a method performed by the apparatus of independent claim 18, a rejection is made on identical grounds to claim 1. Note that independent claim, contrary to independent claim 18, is limited to the means disclosed in the application, and thus is potentially narrower than independent claim 18. Independent claim 1 is thus more subject to file wrapper estoppel regarding its interpretation than independent claim 18. Thus, applicant should bear in mind that remarks regarding broadest reasonable interpretation of "means plus function" language would be less relevant and restrictive to method claims, which are frequently but not always broader than the identical claims in "means plus function" form.
- 20. Per dependent claim 2, IBM85 demonstrates all elements of independent claim 1, supra; including:

wherein said first formatting means includes column determining means for automatically determining the quantity of said at least one column comprising each said display page ("newspaper column"). It is noted that IBM85 explicitly provides for one column of text, which is believed to read on this claim as written. If applicant argues otherwise, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide for a second column in IBM85, as suggested by the reference ("newspaper column") in order to reduce page flipping. Furthermore, multi-column formats that enable rapid reading were notoriously well-

Art Unit: 2779

known in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ multi-columns and a selection device in IBM85 to enhance the format options available to the user of IBM85.

Per dependent claim 19, a method performed by the apparatus of independent claim 2, a rejection is made on identical grounds to claim 2. Please note remarks regarding means plus function language, which is frequently narrower than the corresponding method claim. However, in the present case applicant has generically claimed computing apparatuses for performing the claimed functions.

- Per dependent claim 3, IBM85 demonstrates all elements of independent claim 2, supra; including: "said column determining means configured to automatically determine the actual width of said at least one column" ("values affecting window width")
- 22. Per dependent claim 20, a method performed by the apparatus of independent claim 3, a rejection is made on identical grounds to claim 3. Please note remarks regarding means plus function language, which is frequently narrower than the corresponding method claim. However, in the present case applicant has generically claimed computing apparatuses for performing the claimed functions.
- 23. Per dependent claim 4, IBM85 demonstrates all elements of independent claim 1, supra; including:

Art Unit: 2779

wherein said second formatting means and said display means are configured to automatically utilize a user selected font for said plurality of display pages ("primary display font").

Per dependent claim 21, a method performed by the apparatus of independent claim 4, a rejection is made on identical grounds to claim 4. Please note remarks regarding means plus function language, which is frequently narrower than the corresponding method claim. However, in the present case applicant has generically claimed computing apparatuses for performing the claimed functions.

- 24. Claims 5, 22, 7 and 14 are rejected under 35.U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over <u>Anonymous</u>, International Business Machines Technical Disclosure Bulletin, v. 28, n. 2, entitled "Method to Permit Rapid Reading of Displayed Text", pp. 513-515 reprinted on 2 pages (page numbers of references not employed in rejection since it is a short text dump), hereinafter IBM85.
- 25. Per dependent claim 5, IBM85 demonstrates all elements of independent claim 1, supra; including:

wherein said second formatting means and said display means are configured to automatically utilize a user selected size of font for said plurality of display pages ("primary display font"). The examiner believes that the change in font size according to user preference was inherent in "primary display font". However, if applicant should disagree, "Official Notice" is hereby taken that it was notoriously well-known to change font size in display windows. It would

Page 14

Art Unit: 2779

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to change the font size in IBM85 in order to increase the amount of user preferences available to the user.

Per dependent claim 22, a method performed by the apparatus of independent claim 5, a rejection is made on identical grounds to claim 5. Please note remarks regarding means plus function language, which is frequently narrower than the corresponding method claim. However, in the present case applicant has generically claimed computing apparatuses for performing the claimed functions.

26. Per dependent claim 7, IBM85 demonstrates all elements of independent claim 1, *supra*; including claimed font changing means ("primary display font"). Examiner contends that this teaching explicitly provides for a change in font size. Should applicant dispute that this is taught by IBM85, then it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to change font size as was notoriously known in the art of display window sizing. Per the limitation of maintaining the column width within a predetermined range of characters per line, this would have been accomplished by expanding window size, as was notoriously well-known, or by reducing the number of characters per line of IBM85, according to user preferences.

Per dependent claim 24, a method performed by the apparatus of independent claim 7, a rejection is made on identical grounds to claim 7. Please note remarks regarding means plus function language, which is frequently narrower than the corresponding method claim due to file wrapper estoppel. However in the present case, it appears that the "means" applicant is referring to are generically an and all computer apparatuses for performing the claimed methods.

Art Unit: 2779

Claims 6, 8-11, 13-17, 23, 25-28, and 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Anonymous, International Business Machines Technical Disclosure Bulletin, v.28, n. 2, entitled "Method to Permit Rapid Reading of Displayed Text", pp. 513-515 reprinted on 2 pages (page numbers of references not employed in rejection since it is a short text dump), hereinafter IBM85, in view of Nehab et al., US Patent no. 6,029,182 A (2/2000), hereinafter Nehab

Per dependent claim 6, IBM85 demonstrates all elements of independent claim 1, supra; except: "wherein said second formatting means is responsive to in-line formatting commands included in the source document". Nehab, on the other hand, demonstrates re-formatting a "flat", i.e., scrollable, document, as well as hypertext pages which are scrollable, Figure 3D, into a more palatable multi-column paginated documents displayed on a display device ("fully personalized newspaper is sent to output interface 40 [which] could be display interface 11"--col. Col. 12, lns. 58-63) and is responsive to in-line formatting commands (col. 15, lines 30-40, and lines 45-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Nehab and IBM85, in order to allow IBM85 to format web pages into columnar displays, and thus increase the sources of rapid reading of IBM85.

Per dependent claim 23, a method performed by the apparatus of independent claim 6, a rejection is made on identical grounds to claim 6. Please note remarks regarding means plus function language, which is frequently narrower than the corresponding method claim. However

Art Unit: 2779

in the present case, it appears that the "means" applicant is referring to are generically an and all computer apparatuses for performing the claimed methods.

- 28. Per dependent claim 8, IBM85 demonstrates all elements of independent claim 1, *supra*; except: "resizing means for automatically resizing a graphic image or table included in the source document to fit within said at least one column". Nehab, on the other hand, demonstrates reformatting scrollable web documents, and further resizing graphic images to fit in one column (col. 15, lns. 37-39, see also figure 9c. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Nehab with IBM85 by including provisions for reformatting images in its "text stream" in order to provide a rapidly digestible format of the resultant text/ image screen, as suggested by both IBM85 ("Rapid Reading", and "newspaper column",) and Nehab ("personalized newspaper"-abstract)
- 29. Per dependent claim 25, a method performed by the apparatus of independent claim 8, a rejection is made on identical grounds to claim 8. Please note remarks regarding means plus function language, which is frequently narrower than the corresponding method claim due to file wrapper estoppel. However in the present case, it appears that the "means" applicant is referring to are generically an and all computer apparatuses for performing the claimed methods.
- 30. Per dependent claim 9, IBM85 and Nehab demonstrates all elements of dependent claim 8, supra; except: "wherein said resizing means includes icon forming means for automatically displaying the graphic image or table as an icon in said at least one column in a respective one of said plurality of display pages". Nonetheless, Nehab teaches stripping all images and providing a

Art Unit: 2779

known to render compound documents as text with imbedded image icons. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to embed hyperlinked image icons in IBM85 and Nehab in order to further permit rapid reading of the text downloaded from the web, for example, and allow pictures to be hyperlinked for selective viewing.

Per dependent claim 26, a method performed by the apparatus of independent claim 9, a rejection is made on identical grounds to claim 9. Please note remarks regarding means plus function language, which is frequently narrower than the corresponding method claim due to file wrapper estoppel. However in the present case, it appears that the "means" applicant is referring to are generically an and all computer apparatuses for performing the claimed methods.

- Per dependent claim 10, IBM85 and Nehab demonstrates all elements of dependent claim 9, supra; except: "wherein said resizing means further includes expanding means for selectively displaying the graphic image or table in the size anticipated by the source document by mouse clicking respective said icon". Nonetheless, this was notoriously well-known, i.e., hyperlinking images to documents with icons, and is thus implicit in the rejection of claim 10, supra.
- 32. Per dependent claim 27, a method performed by the apparatus of independent claim 10, a rejection is made on identical grounds to claim 10. Please note remarks regarding means plus function language, which is frequently narrower than the corresponding method claim due to file wrapper estoppel. However in the present case, it appears that the "means" applicant is referring to are generically an and all computer apparatuses for performing the claimed methods.

Art Unit: 2779

Per dependent claim 11, it was notoriously well-known to maintain height to width ratio, i.e., aspect, when re-sizing an image in order to avoid distorting the image. Thus this feature was inherent in Nehab (col. 15, lines 35-40), and thus implicit in the combination described of IBM85 and Nehab. The method and motivation for combination are as set forth in rejections, supra.

Page 18

- 34. Per dependent claim 28, a method performed by the apparatus of independent claim 7, a rejection is made on identical grounds to claim 11. Please note remarks regarding means plus function language, which is frequently narrower than the corresponding method claim due to file wrapper estoppel. However in the present case, it appears that the "means" applicant is referring to are generically an and all computer apparatuses for performing the claimed methods.
- 35. Per dependent claim 13, IBM85 demonstrates all elements as applied in the rejection of independent claim 12, *supra*, except: "wherein said page-forming mechanism includes a content formatter mechanism configured to be operatively responsive to formatting commands embedded in the electronic document."

Nehab, on the other hand, demonstrates re-formatting a "flat", i.e., scrollable, document, as well as hypertext pages which are scrollable, Figure 3D, into a more palatable multi-column paginated documents displayed on a display device ("fully personalized newspaper is sent to output interface 40. [which] could be display interface 11"--col. Col. 12, lns. 58-63) and is responsive to in-line formatting commands (col. 15, lines 30-40, and lines 45-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Nehab and

9003972 (STOOB)

Page 19

Art Unit: 2779

IBM85, in order to allow IBM85 to format web pages into columnar displays, and thus increase the sources of rapid reading of IBM85.

Per dependent claim 30, a method performed by the apparatus of dependent claim 13, a rejection is made on identical grounds to dependent claim 13. Please note remarks regarding means plus function language, which is frequently narrower than the corresponding method claim due to file wrapper estoppel. However in the present case, it appears that the "means" applicant is referring to are generically an and all computer apparatuses for performing the claimed methods.

Per dependent claim 14, IBM85 and Nehab demonstrates all elements as applied in the rejection of dependent claim 13, *supra*, including "wherein said page-forming mechanism includes a font-sizing mechanism configured to operatively permit a user to selectively alter the size of the characters comprising said non-scrollable pages".

The examiner believes that the change in font size according to user preference was inherent in "primary display font". However, if applicant should disagree, "Official Notice" is hereby taken that it was notoriously well-known to change font size in display windows. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to change the font size in IBM85 in order to increase the amount of user preferences available to the user.

Per independent claim 31, a method performed by the apparatus of independent claim 14, a rejection is made on identical grounds to independent claim 14. Please note remarks regarding means plus function language, which is frequently narrower than the corresponding method claim

Page 20

Art Unit: 2779

due to file wrapper estoppel. However in the present case, it appears that the "means" applicant is referring to are generically an and all computer apparatuses for performing the claimed methods.

37. Per dependent claim 15, IBM85 demonstrates all elements of independent claim 12, *supra*; except: "resizing means for automatically resizing a graphic image or table included in the source document to fit within said at least one column". Nehab, on the other hand, demonstrates reformatting scrollable web documents, and further resizing graphic images to fit in one column (col. 15, lns. 37-39, see also figure 9c. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Nehab with IBM85 by including provisions for reformatting images in its "text stream" in order to provide a rapidly digestible format of the resultant text/ image screen, as suggested by both IBM85 ("Rapid Reading", and "newspaper column",) and Nehab ("personalized newspaper"—abstract).

Per dependent claim 32, a method performed by the apparatus of independent claim 15, a rejection is made on identical grounds to independent claim 15. Please note remarks regarding means plus function language, which is frequently narrower than the corresponding method claim due to file wrapper estoppel. However in the present case, it appears that the "means" applicant is referring to are generically an and all computer apparatuses for performing the claimed methods.

38. Per dependent claim 16, maintaining aspect ratio of an image when resizing was notoriously well-known. The rationale for rejection of dependent claim 16 is substantially

Art Unit: 2779

was within the relevant citations of Nehab, since it was notoriously well-known to maintain aspect ratio when resizing images in order to reduce distortional effects.

Per dependent claim 33, a method performed by the apparatus of independent claim 16, a rejection is made on identical grounds to dependent claim 16. Please note remarks regarding means plus function language, which is frequently narrower than the corresponding method claim due to file wrapper estoppel. However in the present case, it appears that the "means" applicant is referring to are generically an and all computer apparatuses for performing the claimed methods.

39. Per dependent claim 17, IBM85 and Nehab demonstrates all elements as applied in the rejection of dependent claim 15, supra. Per, selectively viewing a document in it original size, this was notoriously well-known in Internet publishing. It would have been obvious to allow a suer to click on an image of Nehab and IBM85 to selectively display it at full size in order to allow the user to see the full detail in an image as was notoriously well-known in the art of Internet publishing.

Per dependent claim 34, a method performed by the apparatus of independent claim 17, a rejection is made on identical grounds to independent claim 17. Please note remarks regarding means plus function language, which is frequently narrower than the corresponding method claim due to file wrapper estoppel. However in the present case, it appears that the "means" applicant

Page 22

Art Unit: 2779

is referring to are generically an and all computer apparatuses for performing the claimed methods.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

(Continued under separate art)

- 5. Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corel, WordPerfect, 1996, screenshots cited by applicant (hereinafter referred to as Corel).
- With respect to independent claim 1, -- for automatically formatting a screen page that is fully displayable in the window, reformatting the source document to display the document comprising a plurality of sequential display pages, filling the display window with displayed pages, each being separately and fully displayable in the display window, Corel discloses the reformatting the document when the user clicks on View function, then Two Page (pages 1-2), and the document is divided into screen pages separately and fully displayed on the window (pages 3 and 4), -- for paging without scrolling through said plurality of display pages, the user, by using the PageUp and Page Down buttons, can display the pages selectively and sequentially without scrolling.

It is noted that Corel fails to disclose explicitly how to format a screen page such that the screen page comprise at least one column, each having a column width corresponding to a number

Art Unit: 2779

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated that feature to Corel because the fact that Corel divides the source document into a plurality pages which are fully displayable on the window shows that the system formats the pages such that said page conforms with the condition disclosed above.

- 41. With respect to claims 2 and 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Corel discloses the ability of formatting a one-column document into a multiple-column document by using the Column function. When clicking on 3 Columns, for example, the document with one column becomes the document with 3 columns (pages 5-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated the column determining means and its functions to Corel because the Corel system shows the ability of formatting the columns for a document as desired thus motivating the determining the quantity and the actual width of these columns.
- 42. With respect to claims 4, 5, 6, which are dependent on claim 1, Corel discloses the font that the user can select for the display page (pages 10- 11), and the font size commands for the user to select for the display page (pages I I 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified the second formatting and the display means to Corel because Corel has the font and the font size that allow the user to select the desired font and font size for the display page by clicking on the appropriate commands.

Art Unit: 2779

43. With respect to claim 7, which is dependent on claim 5, as disclosed in claim 4, Corel provides the font and the size functions that changes the format of the display page when the user clicks on the desired size. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated the font changing means for selectively changing the size of the font and the first format to Corel because Corel has the font size function which changes the format of the display page in response to the size selection of the user.

- With respect to claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Corel discloses the inclusion of the graphic image and table in the source document and the resizing of said image and table to fit within a display page (pages 13-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have utilized the feature of Corel because Corel shows the resizing of the graphic image which is the function of the resizing means as claimed.
- 45. With respect to claim 9, which is dependent on claim 9, Corel discloses the object embedded in the document, which is displayed as icon (pages 17-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated this feature of Corel because Corel provides the ability of displaying an object, which is an graphic image, as an icon as claimed.
- 46. With respect to claim 10, which is dependent on claim 9, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have included the expanding means to Corel because it was well known that the icon is an active symbol that

Page 25

Art Unit: 2779

represents an application or an object, and that the icon allows the user to open an application or an object by clicking on it.

- 47. With respect to claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified the resizing means to Corel because the fact that Corel provides the selection of sizes that allows the user to switch from one size to another shows that the system can maintain the height-to-width ratio of the graphic image or table during the resizing and expanding.
- With respect to independent claim 12; as disclosed in claim 1, -- for a page-forming mechanism configured to automatically arrange the scrollable electronic information document into a plurality of non-scrollable pages, Corel shows the dividing a source document, which is scrollable, into a multiple-page document, which is non-scrollable (pages 1-4), -- for a screen having a display window configured to simultaneously display a selected one of said plurality of non-scrollable pages, Corel discloses and the displaying of two pages at a time on the display window (pages 3-4), -- for a page-turning mechanism configured to selectively, sequentially and individually display said plurality of non-scrollable in said display window, it was well known to use of the PageUp and Page Down buttons to selectively, sequentially display selected pages in the display window.

It is noted the Corel fails to disclose the display of selected one of a plurality of non-scrollable pages in its entire window. However, it would have been obvious to one of

Page 26

Application/Control Number: 09003972 (STOUB)

Art Unit: 2779

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified this feature of

Corel because Corel shows the formatting of a scrollable document into a non-scrollable

document and the display of two non-scrollable pages selectively and sequentially, thus motivating
the editing of display of one non-scrollable page instead of two as claimed.

- With respect to claims 13 and 14, Corel has the commands of changing the font as well as the size of characters in response to the user selection (pages 9-12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have utilized the feature of Corel because Corel includes formatting commands for formatting the content of the page.
- With respect to claims 15-17, Corel discloses the change in the size of the graphic image to conform to the width of the one column page (pages 13-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have utilized the feature of Corel because the fact that Corel shows the altering the size of the image to fit with the width of the page implies that Corel includes a image sizing mechanism that can maintain proportionately the altering of the size of the graphic images and tables to conform to the width of the at least one column page.
- Claims 18-34 are the method claims for converting a-scrollable source document into non-scrollable displayed page applied on the system disclosed in claims 1- 17, and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

11

Art Unit: 2779

Remarks

Style sheets enabling multiple columns on a display were notoriously well-known ion the art at the time of the invention. The purpose of a style sheet generally was to take mark-up language, which was in scrollable form on a text editor, and reformat it in many different ways in accordance with user preferences (see, e.g., US 5,860,073 A assigned to Microsoft, esp. Col. 2, lns 35-42; col. 3, lns. 10-20 and 39-44; col. 5, lns. 60-65; col. 6, lns. 30-36, 45-50, 60-65; col. 7, lns. 10-16; 30-37). Furthermore, within the art of record are publishing systems capable of formatting text to multiple columns (see e.g., US 5,634,064 assigned to Adobe Systems). Furthermore, it was also notoriously well-known in the art to print preview an entire set of multiple page without scrolling. Applicant may chose to argue that a print preview was not usually readable. However, monitor technologies existed which would preview a text document at sufficient resolution to provide a readable preview of a to be published multi-column document. In fact, desktop publishers would have wanted the best and biggest monitors available in order to preview a document page by page. Furthermore, the patent office employed well before the time of Applicant's invention large monitors capable of displaying a full 8 ½ x 11 page at sufficient resolution to view the entire page. The system was call the Advanced Patent System (APS). Applicant should consider all of these technologies when amending the broadest claims. Finally, it is noted that applicant's broadest claims appear to read on the page up page down key, employed with a conventional word processor.

Page 27

Art Unit: 2779

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patents

US 4 608 644	see abstract					
US 4,686,649	see abstract					
US 4,891,771	see entire patent, esp. fig. 4 which demonstrat	es scrollable text re-				
formatted in columnar form						
US 5,089,990	see entire patent					
US 5,634,064	see examiner's comments, supra					
US 5,633,996	see figures					
US 5,737,558	see abstract					
US 5,860,073	see examiner's remarks supra					
US 5,909,690	see "book metaphor" representative of a large	e body of art dedicated				
to electronic books (figures)						
US 5,926,825	see abstract					

Art Unit: 2779

Conclusion

52. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to

(703)-308-9051 (formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703)-305-9724 (informal communications labeled PROPOSED or DRAFT)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Sixth Floor Receptionist, Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey ROSSI whose telephone number is (703) 308-5213. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 0830 to 1630 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark POWELL, can be reached on (703) 305-9703.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

JR

April 28, 2000

MARK R. POWELL SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

GROUP 2700